

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 6, 10, 34, 39, 43, 44, 48 and 52 are amended herein to claim that the message from the first client to the second client in claims 1, 10, 34, 43, 44 and 52 and subscribers is claims 6, 39 and 48, are not received by the second client (subscribers) unless they pass filtering for specific topics on interest to the second clients (subscribers).

Claims 1, 6, 34, 44 and 48 are rejected in the Office Action as being unpatentable over claims in copending Application No. 11/234,987 (hereinafter '987) in view of Leeds et al. US Patent Publication 2002 /138588 (hereinafter Leeds) further in view of Appelman et al. U.S. Patent 6,539,421 (hereinafter Appelman). The rejection is traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

A terminal disclaimer signed by a registered attorney is filed herewith to overcome the rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground. Further, Leeds discloses a system wherein a client computer 10 shown in Fig. 1 sends a request for a web page to a server computer 60 which hosts an agent 360 (see paragraph [0032] and [0040]). The agent 360 at the server analyzes the phrase in a posted statement and suggests back to the user related chat forums the client may wish to join (see paragraph [0047]). In the alternative, the server agent 360 could automatically open these chat forums (paragraph [0047]). Leeds also teaches that the agent 360 can further provide the function of answering questions or commenting on messages posted to a chat session (paragraph [0049]). This is different than claims 1, 6, 34, 44 and 48 wherein a first client sends a first message to second client, wherein the message is related to a topic of interest, and wherein a second client filters at the second client, the message, and if the message is of specific interest to the second client, a second message is sent to the first client including further information pursuant to the specific interest in the first message. In Leeds, the results of the analysis by the agent 360 results in suggestions which are sent to the client computer 10. In Leeds, the analysis is not of topics of specific interest to the second client (server computer), but is to make suggestions to the client computer. In Leeds Paragraph [0049], the messages from the client computer is posted in the chat session whereas the claims have been amended to make clear that the message is not received by the second client unless it passes the claimed filtering as being of specific interest to the second client. In the claims 1, 6, 34, 44 and 48, the second

message includes further information pursuant to the specific interest in the first message, as claimed. It is submitted that claims 1, 6, 34, 44 and 48 are allowable over '987 in view of Leeds and further in view of Appelman, which allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 10, 31, 33-37, 43-46 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appelman et al. U.S. Patent 6,539,421 (hereinafter Appelman) in view of Robertson et al. U.S. Patent 6,209,100 (hereinafter Robertson) in view of Leeds et al. U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0138588 (hereinafter Leeds). The rejection is traversed in reconsideration is requested.

As discussed earlier, Leeds discloses a system wherein a client computer 10 shown in Fig. 1 sends a request for a web page to a server computer 60 which hosts an agent 360 (see paragraph [0032] and [0040]). The agent 360 at the server analyzes the phrase in a posted statement and suggests back to the user related chat forums the client may wish to join (see paragraph [0047]). In the alternative, the server agent 360 could automatically open these chat forums (paragraph [0047]). Leeds also teaches that the agent 360 can further provide the function of answering questions or commenting on messages posted to a chat session (paragraph [0049]). This is different than claims 1-4, 10, 31, 33-37, 43-46 and 52 wherein a first client sends a first message to a second client, wherein the message is related to a topic of interest, and wherein a second client filters at the second client, the message, and if the message is of specific interest to the second client, a second message is sent to the first client including further information pursuant to the specific interest in the first message. In Leeds, the results of the analysis by the agent 360 results in suggestions which are sent to the client computer 10. In Leeds, the analysis is not of topics of specific interest to the second client (server computer in Leeds), but is to make suggestions to the client computer. In Leeds Paragraph [0049], the messages from the client computer are posted in the chat session whereas the claims have been amended to make clear that the message is not received by the second client unless it passes the claimed filtering as being of specific interest to the second client. It is submitted that claims 1-4, 10, 31, 33-37, 43-46 and 52 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Appelman in view of Robertson in view of Leeds, which allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-9, 39-42 and 48-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appelman in view of Leeds further in view of Robertson. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As discussed earlier, Leeds discloses a system wherein a client computer 10 shown in Fig. 1 sends a request for a web page to a server computer 60 which hosts an agent 360 (see paragraph [0032] and [0040]). The agent 360 at the server analyzes the phrase in a posted statement and suggests back to the user related chat forums the client may wish to join (see paragraph [0047]). In the alternative, the server agent 360 could automatically open these chat forums (paragraph [0047]). Leeds also teaches that the agent 360 can further provide the function of answering questions or commenting on messages posted to a chat session (paragraph [0049]). This is different than claims 6-9, 39-42, 48-51 wherein a first client sends a message to subscribers, wherein the message is related to a topic of interest, and wherein a subscriber filters at the subscriber, the message, and if the message is of specific interest to the subscriber, a second message is sent to the first user including further information pursuant to the specific interest in the first message. In Leeds, the results of the analysis by the agent 360 results in suggestions which are sent to the client computer 10. In Leeds, the analysis is not of topics of specific interest to the second client (server computer in Leeds), but is to make suggestions to the client computer. In Leeds Paragraph [0049], the messages from the client computer are posted in the chat session whereas the claims have been amended to make clear that the message is not received by the subscriber unless it passes the claimed filtering as being of specific interest to the subscriber. It is submitted that claims 6-9, 39-42, 48-51 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Appelman in view of Leeds further in view of Robertson, which allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 30, 32, 38, 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appelman in view of Robertson further in view of Leeds further in view of Kapil et al. U.S. Patent 6,941,345 (hereinafter Kapil). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4 which depends from claim 1, claim 30 depends from claim 1, claim 32 depends from claim 6, claim 38 depends from claim 37 which depends from claim 34, claim 47 depends from claim 46 which depends from claim 44. Claims 1, 6, 34 and 44 are

discussed above. For the same reasons, it is submitted that claims 5, 30, 32, 38, 47 are allowable over Appelman in view of Robertson further in view of Leeds further in view of Kapil, which allowance is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

/FLOYD A. GONZALEZ/

BY: FLOYD A. GONZALEZ-Attorney

Registration No. 26,732

Phone: 845-433-7282

Fax: 845-432-9601